By Dr Sherlock 1

Vol. VII

A N

# ANSWER

To THREE Late

# PAMPHLETS.

*VIZ.*

I. A *Request* to *Protestants*, to Produce Plain Scripture, directly Authorizing these their Tenets.

II. A *Dialogue* between a New *Catholick Convert* and a *Protestant*.

III. *Lucilla* and *Elizabeth*.

---

*LONDON*,
Printed for *Tho. Basset* at the *George*, near St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. 1687.

# AN ANSWER TO THE REQUEST TO PROTESTANTS,

To produce Plain Scriptures directly Authorizing these Tenets.

LICENSED,

*December* 16. 1686.

*LONDON:*

Printed for *Tho. Basset*, at the *George*, near St. *Dunstan's* Church, in *Fleetstreet*, MDCLXXXVII.

## An Anſwer to the Requeſt to Proteſtants,

### (a) *To produce Plain Scriptures directly Authorizing theſe their Tenets.*

(a) *Anſ.* WE do indeed make the Scripture the Rule of our Faith, becauſe we believe God gave us the Scripture to be our Rule, and we know not where to meet with a better; and therefore we do not quarrel at this Requeſt to produce plain Scripture proofs for what we believe; but we may juſtly quarrel at the fallacious or unskilful way of ſtating it, as if we pretended to own no Doctrines, but what are contained in the expreſs Words of Scripture; and therefore, to underſtand this matter, we muſt conſider the ſeveral kinds of Doctrines profeſſed in the Church of *England*, and what kind of proof from Scripture, they are capable of.

1*ſt*, The poſitive Articles of Faith, ſuch as are contained in the Creed, and expreſly taught in Scripture, we prove from plain and expreſs Teſtimonies of Scripture, and are ready to give our proofs of them, when they are demanded. But beſides theſe, 2*ly*, we have a great many Negative Articles, oppoſed to the Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*: Now to believe a Negative, is only to believe that ſuch a Doctrine is not taught in Scripture; and it would be a very wiſe Requeſt, to deſire us to prove by plain and expreſs Scripture, that ſuch a Doctrine is not taught in Scripture. We believe it is not there, becauſe we cannot find it in Scripture, and thoſe who pretend it is there, cannot ſhew it there; which is proof enough, and

all that the thing is capable of. 3*ly*, There are other Doctrines, which, it may be, are not in a ſtrict Senſe, Articles of Faith, but great and uſeful Truths, which cannot be proved by expreſs Words of Scripture, but by immediate and neceſſary Conſequence; and it is ridiculous in theſe Caſes, to demand a *direct* Proof, if by that he means the expreſs words of Scripture, for we never pretended to that in ſuch matters, but think it very reaſonable to believe an evident Conſequence, as well as expreſs Words. Since our Saviour proved the Reſurrection it ſelf by Conſequence, *Matth.* 22. 32. Having premiſed this, I ſhall examine, what it is he would have proved, in which alſo he has betrayed great want either of skill or honeſty, as will appear from particulars.

I. *Scripture is clear, in all Neceſſaries, to every Sober Enquirer.*

*A.* He begins well with demanding a Scripture proof; That the *Scripture is clear in all Neceſſaries*; as if we Proteſtants wanted a Scripture proof, that the Sun ſhines, when we ſee it. Can there be any better proof, that the Scripture is clear and plain, than its own plainneſs? And therefore, every plain Text proves its own plainneſs. If this Propoſition, *Scripture is clear in all Neceſſaries, to every Sober Enquirer*, were contained in expreſs Words in Scripture; yet if we could not find it plain, we ſhould rather queſtion, whether thoſe Words are plain, than believe the Scripture to be plain, when we do not find it ſo. But if I find the Scripture plain, the plainneſs of the Scripture proves it ſelf, and needs no other proof. And yet this is one of thoſe Propoſitions, which may be proved by plain and neceſſary Conſequence from the Scripture. For if the *word of God be a Light unto our Feet, and a Lamp unto our Paths*, then it muſt be clear, if Light be clear, *Pſal.* 119. 105. If it *be able to make men wiſe unto Salvation*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. then it muſt be plain and intelligible in all things neceſſary to Salvation.

II. *The-*

II. *The Secular Prince hath all Spiritual Juriſdiction and Authority, immediately, from and under God.*

*A.* What Authority the Church of *England* grants to Kings in matters of Religion, which he here calls all *Spiritual Juriſdiction, and Authority*, we are taught in the 37*th* Article of Religion: *The Kings Majeſty hath the chief power in this Realm of* England, *and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Eſtates of this Realm, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Civil in all cauſes doth appertain, and is not, and ought not to be ſubject to any foreign Juriſdiction.* Which is further explained, *That we give not our Princes, the Miniſtring of God's Word, or of the Sacraments,* ——— *but that only Prerogative which we ſee to have been given always to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himſelf, that is, that they ſhould rule all Eſtates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the Civil Sword the ſtubborn and evil doers.* Which ſignifies no more, than that the King is ſupreme in his own Dominions, and therefore there is no Power, neither Secular nor Eccleſiaſtick above him; for if there were, he were not Supreme; Muſt we then prove by expreſs Scripture, that the King is Supreme? Do men want Scripture to prove, That Supreme Power is Supreme? Thus ſome men are always in the Extremes, either the Scripture ſignifies nothing, or it muſt be every thing, Grammar, and Dictionary and Logick, and Statute-book, and all; but can they prove by expreſs Scripture, that the King has the Supreme power in Civil cauſes? Then I will prove, That he has the Supreme power in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes; and I think *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers*, is a ſufficient proof of both.

III. *Juſtification by Faith alone* (viz. *a Perſuaſion that we are juſtified*) *is a wholeſome Doctrine.*

*A.* Our Church does teach, *That Juſtification by Faith only is a moſt wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of comfort,* Article

ticle 11. but ſhe does not teach, *That juſtifying Faith is a perſuaſion, that we are juſtified*; and ſure we are not bound to prove that by Scripture, which we do not believe.

IV. *The Subſtance of Bread and Wine remains after, what it was before, Sacerdotal Conſecration.*

*A.* Our Church teaches, That *Tranſubſtantiation (or the change of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ*, Art. 28. But ſhe does not teach, That *the Bread and Wine remain after, what they were before Sacerdotal Conſecration.* Their ſubſtance is the ſame, that is, they are Bread and Wine ſtill, but by virtue of Chriſt's Inſtitution, after Conſecration they are not meer Bread and Wine, but *a Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's death, and to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and by faith receive the ſame, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt, and likewiſe the cup of bleſſing is a partaking of the Blood of Chriſt.* The ſubſtance of Bread and Wine is the ſame, but the Inſtitution gives it ſuch a new relation and uſe, as is equivalent to changing its nature, and makes it the Sacramental Body and Blood of Chriſt. And this the words of Inſtitution are an expreſs proof of, *This is my Body*; for if it be not his Natural Body, as ſenſe and reaſon tell us it cannot be, then it muſt be only his Sacramental Body, or his Body by Inſtitution. Chriſt was viſibly preſent with his Apoſtles in his own Natural Body, when he inſtituted this Sacrament, and therefore they could not underſtand, and our Saviour could never intend they ſhould believe, that the Bread which he bleſſed and brake, was his Natural Body, which they ſaw before their eyes; that they ate their Lord, when they ate the Conſecrated Bread, that they ſwallowed him down into their ſtomachs, and yet all this while ſaw him, and converſed with him, as they did at other times. The Bread is the Body of Chriſt, but it is his broken Body, which it could not be at the Inſtitution of this Sacrament; for Chriſt was not then Crucified, his Natural

Body

Body was not yet broken, and therefore the broken bread, though it was his Sacramental, could not be his Natural Body; his Blood was not then ſhed, and therefore though the Wine was *his Blood of the New Teſtament*, it could not be his Natural Blood which is ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins, unleſs his Natural Body was broken, and his Blood ſhed before he was crucified. Now I take that to be the expreſs ſenſe of Scripture, which is the only ſenſe that can be made of it; for a ſenſe in which it is impoſſible, is none at all.

V. *Our Lord's Preſence in or with the Euchariſt is meerly gracious and influential; and, if more, only to the Faithful.*

*A.* There is no ſuch Propoſition as this taught by the Church of *England*, that I know of; we own the influences of the Divine Grace to accompany the external adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper; and this I ſuppoſe, they will not put us to prove. We own the Sacramental Body and Blood of Chriſt, that is, the Conſecrated Elements, to be really preſent upon the Altar, and *verily* and *indeed* eaten of the Faithful; for ſo our Saviour expreſly tells us, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*; and this is ſomewhat more than to ſay, that *our Lord's Preſence in or with the Euchariſt is meerly gracious and influential*: for ſo he is preſent in all other Religious Duties; but here he is ſo preſent, that his Body and Blood, with all the benefits of his Death and Paſſion, are exhibited to worthy Receivers, as much as they could have been, had we eat his Natural fleſh, and drank his blood. And therefore whatever difference they would allow, between Chriſt's gracious and influential preſence in the Euchariſt, and eating his Natural fleſh and blood, had that been poſſible, the ſame we allow between his gracious Preſence, and eating his Sacramental Body, which is to all the ends and purpoſes of a Sacrament, the ſame by his own Inſtitution, with his Natural fleſh and blood; for the carnal feeding on Chriſt's fleſh, is not a Sacramental eating of him.

But

But if by *more* he means, that Christ is corporally present in the Eucharist, that his natural Flesh and Blood is contained under the Species of Bread and Wine, this we deny, and it being a Negative Article, it is ridiculous, as I observed before, to demand express Scripture, to prove that it is not in the Scripture; let those, who affirm it, prove by express Scripture, that it is there; for *this is my Body, and this is my Blood*, will not do it: We own, that it is the Body and Blood of Christ, as well as they; and therefore they must prove, that it is Christ's natural Body and Blood, and it is well for them, that they have something else than Scripture to trust to.

VI. *Adoration of the Eucharist* (i. e. *of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine*) *is Idolatry.*

*A.* Nor is there any such Proposition as this taught in the Church of *England*. We teach indeed, that Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, remains Bread and Wine after Consecration, and that to adore Bread and Wine is Idolatry, as *Romanists* themselves confess, and is easily proved from Scripture, if to give Divine Worship to Creatures be Idolatry. To adore our Saviour is no Idolatry, but to adore Bread and Wine for our Saviour may be as much Idolatry, as to worship the Sun for God. But this Author puts a fallacy upon his Readers, by an explanatory Parenthesis, *Adoration of the Eucharist* (i. e. *of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine*) as if they only worshipped our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine; whereas they teach that the Species themselves (whatever they be, to be sure, not Christ himself) are to be worshipped together with Christ; and therefore, according to their own Doctrine, they must worship something which is not Christ. And let them consider, what name to give this.

*See the late Discourse of the Adoration of the Host, p. 8, 9. &c.*

VII. *All Christians, whenever they communicate, are obliged to receive in both Kinds.*

*A.* And why does he not ask us to prove, That *all Christians, whenever they communicate, are obliged to receive the Bread?*

*bread?* For there is the ſame Inſtitution for the Wine, that there is for the Bread. There is no other rule in matters of Inſtitution, but to obſerve the Inſtitution; and ſince the Sacrament was inſtituted in both kinds, and neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles have told us, that it is ſufficient to receive in one kind, we think this reaſon enough to aſſert, That all Chriſtians when they do communicate, muſt communicate in both kinds. And indeed this Sacrament is not compleat without it; for if we conſider it as a ſpiritual Feaſt, Wine as well as Bread, to drink as well as to eat, is eſſential to a Feaſt; if we conſider the End of the Inſtitution, to be a commemoration of the Death of Chriſt, and the expiation of his Blood, how can we commemorate Sacramentally the expiation of his Blood, without drinking his Blood, which is ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins? For to eat his Blood together with his Fleſh, as they pretend, does not repreſent his broken Body, and his Blood ſhed, but his whole Body with Fleſh and Blood together, which contradicts the very Inſtitution of this Supper. And if we partake of no benefits in the Sacrament, but what we Sacramentally commemorate, I would deſire this Author to tell me, how thoſe who do not drink the Blood of Chriſt, *this blood of the New Teſtament*, obtain the remiſſion of their ſins? A very material thing for thoſe to conſider, who would be ſure of their Salvation.

VIII. *Chaſtity, deliberately vow'd, may be, inoffenſively, violated.*

*A.* This is no Doctrine of our Church, nor are Proteſtants now concerned in it, though ſome of the Monks and Nuns at the beginning of the Reformation were. There was no ſuch thing known as vowing Chaſtity, as that ſignifies a Vow againſt Marriage; neither under the Law, nor in the times of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and therefore we cannot expect in Scripture an expreſs deciſion of this matter, but muſt argue from the nature and obligation of Vows. And if he pleaſe to conſult the Writings of the firſt Reformers, who were concerned to vindicate themſelves in this point, he will find it eaſier to condemn what they did,

than to anſwer the reaſons, whereby they juſtifie it. Theſe Vows were never thought ſo Sacred, but that the Pope can diſpenſe with them; and what is diſpenſable, neceſſity will diſpenſe with on courſe; and that they themſelves knew beſt. Theſe Monaſtick Vows were undertaken as the moſt excellent ſtate of Religion, as meritorious of pardon and juſtification, which is a fulſom ſuperſtition and corruption of Chriſtianity, and therefore are void and null as all other ſuperſtitions are. And if Monaſtick Vows, as ſuch, do not oblige, as no ſuperſtitions can; then they were free to uſe that liberty, which God and Chriſt had allowed them. But who taught him to call a Vow againſt Marriage, a Vow of Chaſtity, when Marriage it ſelf is a ſtate of Chaſtity? And tho' it be lawful to vow Chaſtity, which is a neceſſary duty, let him prove, that it is lawful for any man, nay a boy, or girl, to vow not to marry, when our Saviour himſelf tells us, this is not in every mans power; and nothing can be a lawful matter for a Vow, but what is in our power. Chriſt indeed tells us of ſome, *Who made themſelves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 19. 12. that is, who voluntarily choſe a devout cœlibacy, not who obliged themſelves againſt Marriage by the Religion of a Vow. But if the Vow of Chaſtity is ſo ſacred, I hope, they keep it better now, than ſome of their Predeceſſors have done; unleſs they think the Vow of Chaſtity only obliges them not to marry, but does not reſtrain them from a vagrant luſt.

IX. *All Chriſtian Excellencies are commanded.*

*A.* This I think St. *Paul* has determined, Phil. 4. 8. *Finally Brethren, whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſoever things are juſt, whatſoever things are pure, whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praiſe, think on theſe things.* If theſe general Expreſſions do not comprehend *all Chriſtian Excellencies*, I know not what does. And indeed, whatever Virtues are commanded, we muſt always reckon that the heights and perfections of thoſe Virtues are commanded,

ded, for God can command nothing leſs than a perfect Virtue; and it is apparent, he has annexed no Limitations to his commands; for we are required *to be perfect, even as our Father, which is in Heaven, is perfect.* Not that every man ſhall be damned, who does not attain to the higheſt Perfections; for through the Merits and Interceſſion of our Saviour, God will accept of a ſincere, tho imperfect Obedience; but ſincerity it ſelf requires our endeavours after Perfection, which could not be our duty, if it were not commanded; and tho a ſincere Chriſtian ſhall be ſaved notwithſtanding his many defects, yet our reward ſhall be proportioned to our ſeveral Degrees and Attainments in Virtue. Nothing is a *Chriſtian Excellency*, but what is an inſtance of ſome Virtue, which is commanded, which will throw a great many meritorious Works, which our Author had an eye on, out of this number, and every degree and act of Virtue becomes more or leſs neceſſary to us, according to our different Qualifications and Circumſtances of Life, according to our Saviours rule, *to whom much is given, of them ſhall be much required.* Theſe uncommanded Chriſtian Excellencies are what the Church of *Rome* call *Works of Supererogation*, which our Church has condemned, Art. 14. in theſe words. *Voluntary Works beſides, over and above Gods commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without Arrogancy and Impiety. For by them men do declare, that they do not only tender unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his ſake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Chriſt ſaith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, ſay, that we are unprofitable Servants.*

X. *Every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is convey'd to Heaven or Hell.*

*A.* The Scripture gives us no account of any other places of rewards and puniſhments in the other World, but Heaven and Hell, and therefore we know of no other. Our Church has expreſly determined, Art. 22. *That the* Romiſh *Doctrine of Purgatory, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of*

*God.* Now, that there are no other places of rewards and punishments but Heaven and Hell, and that there is no such place as Purgatory, where the Souls of Men, who have any Sins to expiate, are purged and tormented with Fire, are Negative Articles, and therefore not to be proved by expreſs and poſitive Teſtimonies of Scripture. But that *every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is conveyed to Heaven or Hell*, is only an inference from this Doctrine, that we know of no other place they ſhould go to after Death, the Scripture having not told us of any other, and Chriſts parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, and St. *Paul*'s deſire *to be diſſolved, and to be with Chriſt*, looking fairly that way. And yet our Church has not poſitively determined this, in reverence, I ſuppoſe, to many of the Ancient Fathers, who did aſſert an intermediate ſtate between Death and Judgment, not a Purgatory, where the Souls of good Men were puniſhed for their Sins, but a ſtate of eaſe and reſt, tho not the higheſt Heavens.

XI. *Deſiring the Interceſſions of the Bleſſed, is more Superſtitious, and Derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorſhip, than entreating the Prayers of Holy Men Militant.*

*A.* This is as plain in Scripture, as that Chriſt is our only Mediator in Heaven, who alone (like the high Prieſt under the Law, who was his Type) is admitted into the Holy of Holies to make Expiation, and to intercede for us. As great a difference as there is between the mutual Prayers of good Men for each other on Earth, and the Interceſſion of Saints for us in Heaven, by ſo much more does the Interceſſion of Saints in Heaven invade the Office and Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, than the Prayers of good Men on Earth. Good men on Earth pray for each other as humble Supplicants, as Members of the ſame Body, as ſubject to the ſame Temptations: Saints in Heaven intercede as powerful Favourites, who by their merits and intereſt with God, obtain Bleſſings for us; and any meritorious Interceſſion is inconſiſtent with the only Mediatorſhip of Chriſt in Heaven. But ſuppoſe we could not prove, that the Interceſſion of Saints in Heaven,

is

is any more inconſiſtent with the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, than the Prayers of good Men on Earth are; does this prove, that we may pray to Saints with all the Solemnities of Devotion, that we do to God or Chriſt, which is to give Divine Honours to Creatures; tho he minces the matter, and calls it, *deſiring the Interceſſions of the Bleſſed*; and might with as good reaſon call his Prayers to Chriſt, only deſiring the Interceſſions of Chriſt; and his Prayers to God, only deſiring ſome Bleſſings of God, as he does of his Friends on Earth. The ſum of what we teach about this matter, is this. That we muſt worſhip none but God, and therefore muſt not pray to Saints and Angels, as our Saviour teaches, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* That there is but one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and therefore we muſt not make more Mediators to our ſelves, nor put our truſt in the interceſſion of Saints and Angels. Thus far we have plain Scripture proof. And then we think common Senſe teaches us the reſt, That it is an Injury to an *only* Mediator, to ſet up other Mediators with him. That good Men on Earth are not Mediators, but Supplicants, which is no encroachment on Chriſt's Mediatorſhip; and that Saints in Heaven, according to the Church of *Rome*, pray as Mediators and Interceſſors, who appear in the Preſence of God for us; and this is not reconcilable with Chriſt's only Mediatorſhip in Heaven.

XII. *Honouring the Croſs, the Reliques and Repreſentations of our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of Reverence as we do the Goſpels, (commonly kiſs'd and ſworn by) Altar, and other Sacred Utenſils, is Idolatry.*

*A.* This is a very reaſonable *Requeſt*, to require us to prove that by Scripture, which we do not believe! Papiſts indeed would excuſe that Worſhip, which they pay to the Croſs, to Reliques and Images, by ſaying, That it is no more than that Reverence, which we allow to the Goſpels, and Religious Utenſils, which is no more than an external Reſpect; but do thoſe, who charge them with Idolatry in worſhipping the Croſs,

Croſs, and Reliques, and Images, charge them only with giving ſome external Reſpects to them, or with giving them formal acts of Worſhip and Adoration? As both the Decrees of their Councils, and the viſible Practice of their Church proves: And if he would have this proved to be Idolatry, he may meet with ſome Proteſtants, who will be ready to oblige him.

XIII. *The Pope is Antichriſt.*

*A.* This indeed has been affirmed by ſome Proteſtants, but is no Article of our Church, and therefore we are not bound to prove it, but when we have a mind to it. No man ever pretended that there is any ſuch Propoſition in Scripture, as that the Pope of *Rome* is Antichriſt, but ſome think that the Characters of Antichriſt and the *Man of Sin*, are much more applicable to him, than the Univerſal Headſhip and Infallibility.

XIV. *Every Prayer, us'd in Divine Offices, muſt be in a Language vulgar, and intelligible to every Auditor.*

*A.* Why he ſhould put us upon proving this from Scripture, I cannot tell, when he knows that St. *Paul* has a whole Chapter to prove it, 1 *Cor.* 14. unleſs he has ſome reſerve in expreſſing it by *every Prayer*. For that indeed, St. *Paul* does not ſay in Words, but his Reaſon ſaies it. For if the Reaſon he aſſigns againſt Prayers in an unknown Tongue, extend to all Prayers; then it proves, that every publick Prayer ſhould be in a Language underſtood by the People. But what is this to the Church of *Rome*, who has all publick Offices in an unknown Tongue? Yes, if they could prove it lawful *ever* to pray in an unknown Tongue, they would preſently prove it lawful always to do ſo; and thus St. *Pauls* diſcourſe againſt praying in an unknown Tongue is confuted for want of ſaying that we muſt never pray in an unknown Tongue. But whether it be not more reaſonable to conclude from St. *Pauls* diſcourſe againſt praying in an unknown Tongue, that we muſt never do ſo, than from his not ſaying, that we muſt never pray in an unknown Tongue, that

we

we may always do so, let any man judg, who has not renounced his own understanding.

XV. *A Company of Christians, voluntarily separating from all other Christian Societies, condemning their Doctrines and Rites, destitute also of any visible Correspondence with them in the Eucharist, in any Religious Assemblies or Solemn Devotions, can, notwithstanding this perverse, intire, and manifest Separation, be a mystical Member of Christ, in Catholick Unity, and a Charitable Part of the Catholick Church.*

*A.* If he applies this to us, it is manifestly false; for tho' we do not communicate with the Church of *Rome* in her corrupt Worship, yet there are many Christian Churches, with which we can and do communicate, and separate our selves no farther from any society of Christians, than they separate themselves from the Primitive and Apostolick Churches. But to gratifie him, Suppose that all the Communions of Christendom were corrupted in their Worship, so that we could not safely communicate with any one of them but our own; yet if the Church of *England* be a true Apostolick Church, in Faith and Worship, and Government, and separates from others only upon account of such corruptions, as will justifie such a separation, what should hinder her from being *a mystical member of Christ, in Catholick unity, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church?* The true Apostolick Faith and Worship does certainly make us the *mystical members* of Christ's Body, or else I desire to know, what does *Catholick Unity* is not violated by a just separation, and dangerous corruptions in Faith and Worship are a just cause of separation: *Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you,* 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. and where there are such corruptions, so fatal and dangerous to mens souls, how far soever such corruptions have spread, it is a greater act of charity to separate, than to communicate with them, as it is greater charity to reprove men for their sins, and forsake their company, than to joyn with them in a wicked confederacy. This is

the

the true ſtate of the caſe, and this we can prove either from the expreſs words of Scripture, or from eaſie and neceſſary conſequences; and this ſhows that it is poſſible, *that a company of Chriſtians*, (not) *voluntarily* (but neceſſarily) *ſeparating from all other Chriſtian Societies, condemning their* (corrupt) *Doctrines and Rites, deſtitute alſo of any viſible correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, in any Religious Aſſemblies, or ſolemn Devotions*, (upon account of ſuch corruptions) *can notwithſtanding this* (not) *perverſe* (but juſt and neceſſary) *ſeparation, be a myſtical member of Chriſt, in Catholick unity, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church*, which is not meerly the preſent Church of one age, but the whole Church, from the times of Chriſt and his Apoſtles to the end of the world. For could we ſuppoſe at any time all the Communions of Chriſtendom to be corrupt but one, that one uncorrupt Church muſt forſake the communion of all others, and yet it would be a member of Chriſt, and a charitable part of the Catholick Church, unleſs it be only numbers, not the purity of Faith and Worſhip, which makes the Catholick Church?

XVI. *The whole Clergy of the Catholick Church may apoſtatize from Fundamental Truth and Holineſs; whilſt part of a National Laity may preſerve both, diſcover the Clergies Defection, and, depriving them, heap to Themſelves Teachers of their own ſending and inſtruction.*

*A.* What he intends by this, I cannot well gueſs; I ſuppoſe, he would have his Readers believe, that the whole Clergy of the Chriſtian world did at the time of the Reformation maintain the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which were rejected and condemned only by the major vote of a Parliament of Lay-men in *England*; which how falſe it is, all the world knows. For,

1. There were many other Churches, and better parts of the Catholick Church, than the Church of *Rome*, which did not own thoſe Doctrines and corruptions, which we reject.

2. Nay the whole Clergy of the *Roman* Church did not. For were

were not our *English* Bishops and Clergy as Zealous in the Reformation, as any Laymen? And were not they Bishops in Communion with the *Roman* Church? Were not the *German* Reformers of the Clergy? And was the whole Clergy then against the Reformation? These are admirable things to be proved by direct Testimonies of Scripture.

3. Nor do we say, that the *Roman* Church her self has *Apostatized from fundamental Truth and Holiness*. We do grant, that they have retained the true Faith and Worship of Christ, tho they have fatally corrupted both, by Additions of their own.

4. If the first discovery of this Defection had been made by Laymen, and afterwards acknowledged by the Clergy, who joyned in the Reformation, I should not have thought the Reformation ever the worse for it. For if the Clergy corrupt Religion, we have Reason to thank God, if he opens the Eyes of honest and disinterested Laymen. But is not this Author very modest in his Requests, who would have us prove his own Calumnies, and spiteful Insinuations from Scripture?

This, I think, is Answer enough to his *Request*. And as for his following Harangue, there is little in it to be answered, but some spiteful and sensless Reflections, which are better despised then answered. But let us briefly consider some of them, lest he should think they cannot be answered.

1. He saies, *In these positive Propositions, our Religion chiefly consists*. And truly it is a very sorry Religion, if it does. But why does not our Religion consist in believing the true Catholick Faith contained in the ancient Creeds? In worshipping God through the Mediation of Jesus Christ, according to the Rules of the Gospel? In obeying all those holy Laws our Saviour has given us? In observing the Sacraments of his own Institution, and as he has instituted them? This is all the Religion we own, and know no other; and why then is not this our Religion? No, *This is the Churches peculiar, and claimed by her against all Novel and Unjust, both Foreigners and Out-laws*. But if this be our Religion, and the Religion of the Catholick Church, how

come we to be *Foreigners and Out-laws?* Why does not the Catholick Faith and Worſhip, make us Members of the Catholick Church? And then we have as good a claim to the Creed and Sacraments as they. No, ſaies our Author, *Whatever they have invented and choſen, that belongs (as ſin to a depraved will) properly to them; thence they derive their Title, and thereto muſt we preciſely confine their Religion.* But now if we have invented and choſen nothing elſe, what then? How do we loſe our right to the Creed and Sacraments, &c. becauſe we will allow of no new Inventions and Additions to it? And yet this is the plain caſe. Our only Diſpute with the Church of *Rome*, is about thoſe corrupt Additions they have made to the Catholick Faith and Worſhip, without any Foundation in Scripture, or Reaſon, or true Antiquity; and therefore our Religion is *preciſely confined* to the old Catholick Faith and Worſhip of the Chriſtian Church, and therefore is properly ours (if they will allow us to have any) becauſe it is all we have. The *German* Reformers indeed, were called *Proteſtants*, from proteſting againſt the Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*, and this only ſhows what they do not believe, and what they will not practice; but they have a better name than this, and that is Chriſtians, which ſhows what their poſitive Faith and Religion is, *viz.* that Faith and Worſhip, which was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and owned and practiſed by the Primitive Church, before theſe Corruptions and Innovations were heard of; and therefore, this is *preciſely* our Religion; what we proteſt againſt, we declare not to be our Religion; ſo ridiculous is it, preciſely to confine our Religion to it.

2*ly*, The next ſubject of his Harangue, is our demands of Scripture-proofs from the Church of *Rome* for their new Faith and Worſhip, which I confeſs is a very hard Requeſt, becauſe they have none. However, he ſays, this makes it juſt for the *Catholick Church* (as they will needs call themſelves) to retort this demand upon us, and to demand our Scripture-proofs; and I confeſs, there is great reaſon for it, and I hope, have done him juſtice;

juſtice; for I ſuppoſe, he would not ask more of us, than we do of them. Now we only demand either the expreſs words of Scripture, or plain and evident conſequences, or the ſilence of Scripture, to prove that a thing is not revealed; and this we are ready to return them as to any Doctrines which we profeſs; and whether we *adulterate Scriptures by corrupt Tranſlations* (ſuch as the vulgar *Latin*) *or Sacrilegious mutilations* (as by leaving out the ſecond Commandment) or *blaſphemous miſapplications* (as applying the Pſalter of *David* to the Virgin *Mary*, by changing *Lord* into *Lady*) or *groſs wreſtings and falſe interpretations* (as proving Supremacy and Infallibility by *Tu es Petrus*, and *Paſce oves*) ſhall be left to every Impartial Reader.

3*ly*, In the next place he reproaches us with the *Socinians*, whom he calls our *Brethren by deſcent and iniquity* who *ſteering by the blaſt of a private ſpirit, the Chart of clear Scripture, and Compaſs of Humane reaſon, have made ſhipwrack of faith.* This is intollerable to ſay, that to follow Scripture and Reaſon, is the way to make ſhipwrack of Faith; which can never be, unleſs Scripture and Reaſon be contrary to Faith, which indeed they are in many things to the Faith of the Church of *Rome*; but God forbid they ſhould be to the true Chriſtian Faith. But have not the *Socinians* made ſhipwrack of Faith by following clear Scripture and Humane reaſon? And will he then ſay, that Scripture and Reaſon are on the *Socinian* ſide? If they be, how can he know that they have made ſhipwrack of Faith? if they be not, then they make ſhipwrack of Faith by not adhering to clear Scripture and Reaſon; and is this a reaſon for us to be aſhamed of following Scripture and Reaſon, becauſe the *Socinians* err by the abuſe of both? There is no doubt, but men who pretend to Scripture and Reaſon may err; and it is demonſtrable, that men who renounce Scripture and Reaſon, muſt err; and we have ſo many inſtances of this in the Church of *Rome*, that it is no great encouragement to us to rely on Church-authority without Scripture and Reaſon. They dare not ſay, that we muſt believe

lieve contrary to Scripture, or that the Scripture is not the Rule of our Faith; but they will allow no body to interpret the Scripture but the Church of *Rome*, which is the most certain way to make her infallible; for to be sure she will not interpret the Scripture against her self; she must be always in the right, if what she says be the Rule of Faith. But we who cannot believe, that God has given us Scripture and Reason to make no use of them; That he has made the Pope or Church of *Rome* infallible, and divested all other Christians of sense and common understanding, have nothing but Reason and Scripture to steer by, and that will neither make us *Socinians*, nor *Papists*.

4*ly*, His parting-blow is about the Supremacy of the King, which he calls *Hobbism*, as if we ever thought, that all men must be of the Kings Religion, *as the sole and Sovereign Judg of all Causes Spiritual?* What we mean by the Kings Supremacy, I have already explained. He has no Spiritual Jurisdiction properly so called; can neither ordain, nor administer the Sacraments, nor has the power of the Keys, but is ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἔξω, as the Church is incorporated into the State, so he has the Government of all Ecclesiastical Persons and Causes. Whatever Secular Authority the Church has, is derived from the Prince, and depends on Secular Laws, and this may be enlarged, retrenched, suspended, by the same Power that gave it; but the Church as a Spiritual Society has Rights of its own, can teach the true Faith, administer Sacraments, inflict Church-Censures, though without any Temporal effect, by an inherent Authority: We thank God, when our Prince, who has the Supreme Authority, does countenance true Religion; But whenever it is otherwise, we are taught to submit all our Temporal Concernments, our Lives, and Bodies, and Estates, to the will of our Prince, but to defend our Church and Religion by a modest, but resolute profession of the true Faith, and meek and patient suffering for it. *FINIS.*

*ADVERTISEMENT.*

There is newly Published two Books, *viz.* A Protestant of the Church of *England*, no *Donat st*, &c Also an Answer to a late Dialogue between a New Catholick Convert and a Protestant. *&c.* Both Sold by *T. Basset* at the *George* near St, *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*.

16

AN

# ANSWER

To a late

# DIALOGUE

Between a New

## Catholick Convert

AND A

# PROTESTANT,

To prove the MYSTERY of the TRINITY to be as absurd a Doctrine as

## TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

By way of short Notes on the said Dialogue.

---

Licensed *December* 7th. 1686.

---

*LONDON*,

Printed for *Thomas Bassett* at the *George* near St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleet-street*. 1687.

A

# DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

(a) A New Catholick Convert,

AND A

# PROTESTANT.

Concerning the Doctrines of the

*Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation.*

(a) THIS *new Catholick Convert* begins well, for the firſt thing he learns, is to believe the *Trinity* to be a groundleſs, abſurd, and unreaſonable Doctrine; and then to believe whatever the Church teaches, if it be not more abſurd than the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; this is a great Improvement of Faith, which we *Proteſtants* can never attain to, for we cannot perſwade our Underſtandings or our Faith to digeſt Abſurdities: but let us hear their Dialogue.

*A.* You cannot imagine how much I am overjoy'd to ſee you. I have been big with Diſcourſe theſe three days for want of Utterance. You may remember, when we talk'd together laſt, (*b*) *we parted in a Diſpute concerning Tranſubſtantiation and the holy Trinity, of their equal Reaſonableneſs and Authority.* I muſt confeſs I was not at that time ſo thorowly arm'd with Reaſons to ſhew you the Parallel: But ſince I have given my ſelf a little leiſure to conſider of it, and I am perſwaded I ſhall be able to give you Satisfaction.

(*b*) This is a little miſtake, if we may gueſs at their laſt Diſcourſe by this Dialogue; for the Deſign is not to prove, *That Tranſubſtantiation and the holy Trinity have equal Reaſonableneſs and Authority*, but that neither of them are reaſonable, or have any Authority. Now though we may allow them to make as bold with Tranſubſtantiation as they pleaſe, yet we cannot but be ſenſible of that Diſhonour which is done to common Chriſtianity, by expoſing the moſt ſacred and venerable Myſtery of it to the Scorn and Deriſion of Infidels and Hereticks. For ſure they cannot think it any great credit to the Doctrine of the Trinity; that it cannot be proved, either by *Tradition*, *Scripture*, or *Reaſon*,

*B.* Sir, you know I am always glad of any Opportunity to gain your good Company, but eſpecially upon ſo good an Occaſion. I'le aſſure you, I am not, nor ever was, an Enemy to Catholick Communion; and if I had not too juſt a Cauſe, I ſhould never ſuffer my ſelf in that which without reaſonable Grounds might be call'd a wilful Schiſm.

*A.* I have no reaſon to doubt your Integrity, and therefore ſhall not queſtion that: I ſhall only deſire the liberty to preſs my old Argument, (*c*) *That you would rely on the Authority of the Church.* I muſt confeſs, you have often queſtion'd the doing of it; but I am ſure, when you ſhall conſider there are Myſteries as well as Doctrines in the Chriſtian Religion, and when you know that (*d*) *Myſteries are not to be fathom'd by Natural Reaſon*, you muſt needs conclude, that in ſome Caſes your (*e*) *ſafeſt way is to truſt Tradition.* Now certainly no one can give us ſo good an account of That, as the Church.

(*c*) This opens the Scene, and ſhews the whole deſign of this Dialogue, to bring men to *rely on the Authority of the Church*; and it is worth the while to conſider, what a notable way this is. The new Convert perſwades his *Proteſtant* Friend to fling away Senſe, and Reaſon, and Scripture, and his own private Judgment, and to rely wholly on the Authority of the Church; for when theſe are out of the way, we may believe the Church in any thing. No, ſaies the *Proteſtant*, I can't believe that which is unreaſonable and abſurd, whoever tells it me. *Convert*, Don't you believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity? Proteſt.* Yes, very heartily. *Convert.* Why then Tranſubſtantiation it ſelf, which you *Proteſtants* make ſuch a noiſe about

about, is not more unreasonable, and has as good foundation in Tradition and Scripture, as the Doctrine of the Trinity. *Protest.* Say you so, my Friend, then why must I believe the Trinity? *Conv.* Because the Church teaches it, and for the same reason you must believe Transubstantiation. *Protest.* Hold there, Sir! what if I will believe neither? then I hope I need not rely upon the Authority of the Church. *Conv.* But you confess you must believe the Trinity. *Protest.* Yes, if it be founded on Scripture and Tradition, and do not contradict the Reason of Mankind, as I have thought hitherto; but if you can perswade me otherwise, I will believe it no longer; unless you can tell me for what reason I must believe that, which I have no reason to believe. Wretched men! who care not what becomes of Christian Religion, if they can but establish the Authority of their Church! nay, care not how much they dishonour the Church itself; for it is no great Commendation of Church-Authority in matters of Faith, that the only use of it is to make men believe without Reason, or in contradiction to it. For it seems, were the Christian Faith reasonable, there were no need of relying on the Churches Authority, at least they would want one of the best Arguments to prove it.

(*d*) There are some Mysteries above Reason, none contrary to it, as Transubstantiation is.

(*e*) The universal Tradition of the Church, in conjunction with Scripture, I grant is a very good Foundation for our Faith; but what shall we do, when there is no certain Tradition, as he proves there is not for the Doctrine of the Trinity; for though we should allow, that the safest way is to receive these Traditions from the Church, yet we cannot receive them from her, if she have them not; and she cannot have them, if there be none; and we must conclude there are none, if they be not visible. For the Churches word, whatever Authority it have, is not Tradition.

*B.* But, Sir, to be short, What relation has this to the present Parallel of the Trinity and Transubstantiation? The Authority of the Church is another Point as disputable as That.

*A.* Very much: For as (*f*) *These two Doctrines have equal ground from*

*from Scripture, Reaſon, and Tradition; ſo 'is there the ſame Obligation of your receiving one, as well as the other.* And indeed I have ſince wonder'd at my own Profeſſion, (g)*while a Proteſtant, to think how blind and partial I was*: But I muſt confeſs, becauſe we are in a Diſpute, it is better laying by ſuch aggravating Circumſtances; and indeed I cannot but be ſenſible what Prejudices ſuch Diſcourſes always make, and therefore I ſhall ſpeak nothing more of that nature.

(f) That is none at all, as he attempts to prove; and if the Trinity have no better then Tranſubſtantiation it has none, and then let him ſhow how we are obliged to believe either, as I obſerved before.

(g) For what? for not believing Tranſubſtantiation as well as the Trinity? Did he then, while a Proteſtant, believe the Doctrine of the Trinity to be as unreaſonable, and to have no better Foundation in Scripture and Tradition then Tranſubſtantiation? For otherwiſe he was not partial in believing one and rejecting the other, and if he did, he never underſtood his Religion, and then no wonder that he takes Sanctuary in a Church which requires no uſe of his underſtanding.

*B.* But to return to the main Point; I muſt tell you, I do not think them equally grounded on Scripture, Reaſon, or Tradition; and indeed you may remember that was the old Point in diſpute with us.

*A.* (h) *Well, Sir, to ſhew you your Error, I ſhall begin with the ſeveral Particulars in their Order; and ſo, firſt, as to the Tradition of Tranſubſtantiation.* Now 'tis evident That has been deliver'd with leſs interruption than that of the Holy Trinity: That Myſtery was queſtion'd in the very Infancy of the Church; nay, not only ſo, but the *Arians* prevail'd much againſt it about the beginning of the Fourth Age. On the other ſide, Tranſubſtantiation lay unqueſtion'd and quiet a long time; and when it came to debate, there was no ſuch oppoſition as that of *Arius*, to call in queſtion the Authority of its Tradition; the Church receiv'd it unanimouſly, and in that ſenſe continu'd, till raſh Reaſon attempted to fathom the unlimited Miracles and Myſteries of God.

(h) Here is a great mixture of confidence and fallacy: Confidence is aſſerting what is falſe, that *Tranſubſtantiation has been delivered with leſs interruption than that of the Holy Trinity*: for none of the Ancient Fathers make the leaſt mention of it, neither the name nor the thing was known for many hun-

der'd

der'd years after Christ. He himself modestly grants, that the *Fathers are not half so expres in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as they are in the Mystery of the Holy Trinity*: And when he grants half, you may safely conclude they say nothing of it: but the fallacy consists in attributing this silence of the Fathers about Transubstantiation *to the unquestionableness of the Tradition*, when it was wholly owing to the Ignorance of the Doctrine: It was not opposed in those days, because they never heard of Transubstantiation, not because it was universally believed; which is a reason indeed, why it should not be opposed, but not why it should never be mentioned. Whereas from that opposition, *Arius* and his followers made to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in the beginning of the Fourth Century, and that great alarum it gave immediately to the Christian Church; it is evident that it was the received Faith at and before that time; for otherwise *Arius* would not have opposed it, nor Catholick Bishops so Zealously have defended it.

*B.* But the Fathers are not half so expres in the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, as they are in the Mistery of the Holy Trinity.

*A.* That's true, and there's very good Reason for it: Transubstantiation has not been a Doctrine so long in dispute, and 'tis not customary for Men to argue unquestionable Truths. And whereas you may think that Transubstantiation has of late receiv'd such shrewd Repulses by your Books, I'le assure you, you forget how much the true Catholick Zeal destroys the Seeds of Heresies. Do you think that so many Bishops, not only of the Eastern, but of the Western Church also, could be *Arians*, and yet suppose that that Opinion wanted (*i*) *as Plausible a pretence of Tradition*? Certainly if you consider that, you cannot think to establish the Doctrine of the Trinity by Tradition more than Transubstantiation; especially considering the strong Footsteps of that Sect even in the Fathers now extant. I would cite you some of them, but that they are not so much to my main Design, and indeed my aim is Brevity.

(*i*) *Arius* did not set up upon Tradition, but upon a pretence of Scripture and Reason, and if *Arianism* had had so good a pretence to Tradition, it is strange it should have been thought so new and surpizing a Doctrine at that time. It was never

never heard of before *Arius*, and that is proof enough that it was no Tradition of the Church, though afterwards they endeavoured to force some expressions in the Writings of the Antient Fathers as well as of the Scriptures, to countenance that Heresie.

*B.* Well, Sir, 'tis true, we cannot so well plead Tradition to what you have urg'd; and especially when I call to mind, (*k*) *that* Arianism *was confirm'd by a General Council:* But we alledge an higher ground; we stand upon the Authority of the Scriptures, and indeed that is the true Thuchstone of all Doctrine.

(*k*) I hope he does not mean the Council of *Nice*, which was the first General Council; and assembled on purpose to Establish the Catholick Faith in this point, and to condemn *Arius*. And does the Church of *Rome* own any for a General Council, which confirmed *Arianism*? The Council of *Syrmium* indeed, where *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* Subcribed the *Arian* Confession, may bid fair for it, if a Council of Eastern and Western Bishops confirmed by the Pope, may pass for a General Council; but what then becomes of the Infallibility of Popes, and Councils, and Tradition? This is a desperate Man, who will not spare the Church of *Rome* her self, nor General Councils if they stand in his way, rather than allow any Tradition for the Doctrine of the Trinity.

*A.* 'Tis true, if you will follow the Catholick Church, (*l*) *and take the Scriptures literally, you may discover the Mystery of the Holy Trinity in them*; but if you once yield to Figurative Allusions and Interpretations, the *Arians* will be as much too hard for you, as you imagin your selves to be for the Catholick Church. (*m*) *In short, both Doctrines will be at a loss, and both equally require the Authority of the Church to support them.*

(*l*) If the Trinity can be prov'd by Scripture, that is all we desire, for I am sure Transubstantiation cannot; and as for literal or figurative Expositions of Scripture, neither of them must be always used, but as the Subject Matter and Circumstances of the place require.

(*m*) I thought the Christian Church had been built upon the Faith of the Holy Trinity, not that supported by the Authority of the Church, unless the Church can support her own Foundation

Foundation; if there can be no Christian Church without Baptism in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that is, without professing the Faith and Worship of the ever blessed Trinity; this Doctrine must be believ'd before there can be any Church, on whose Authority we must believe it; and therefore he has chose the unfittest Doctrine to build on Church Authority that he could have thought on.

*B.* O no, surely the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is more expres in Scriptures than so.

*A.* To satisfie you that what I say is Truth, because I may represent the Parallel the clearer, (*n*) *I will personate an* Arian, that Sect so often condemn'd by the Ancient Church, and you shall see his Plea against the Trinity is as fair as yours against Transubstantiation. And because this is the main Parallel, I shall be somewhat the longer, that I may give you the greater satisfaction.

(*n*) An excellent part for a *Roman* Catholick to act. We read that the Devil sometimes transforms himself into an Angel of Light, but never that an Angel of Light transformed himself into a Devil. To Dispute seriously, and in good earnest against the Scripture Proofs of the Trinity, as he here does, though with no great understanding, I should think little better then Blasphemy; it is what would have never been endured in the Primitive Church, and which I think no Christians of any Communion ought to endure; for this is not the concernment of any particular Church, but of common Christianity. But though he can Personate an *Arian* so well, he should consider how he can dispute against him. He yields him all the Scripture Proofs for the Trinity, as not sufficient without the Authority of the Church; the *Arian* thanks him for giving the Scripture on his side, and is contented he should make the best he can of his Church Authority, and so continues an *Arian* still.

*B.* I shall be very glad to hear what you can speak to the matter.

*A.* (*o*) *First then, I say, 'Tis highly unreasonable to interpret that Text,* 1 *John* 5. 7. That *there be Three in Heaven that bear record, and those Three are One*; as likewise *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are One*, literally; for if we do, we not only oppose Sense and Reason, but we make Construction directly against the very Scripture, *John* 10. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. and *John* 17. 21, 22,

23. 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. And what can be urg'd more againſt us in reſpect of Tranſubſtantiation?

*B.* Very right, Sir, that Interpretation carries a forcible Reaſonableneſs, but the Doctrine of the Trinity do's not wholly depend upon thoſe Two Proofs.

*A.* Right, it do's not; but I can give you further Demonſtration in this Parellel. A principal Ground of the Trinity is becauſe the Son is ſo often call'd God in Scripture, as *John* 1. 1, 2. *Rom.* 9. 5. *&c.* Now if we did not comply with the Catholick Church, and make a Literal Conſtruction in this Caſe likewiſe, how ſtrangely ſhould we be confounded by thoſe Texts (1) *where this Godhead in Chriſt is declar'd to be no more than Lordſhip, and ſubordinate to the Father*, as *Heb.* 1. 8. 9. 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27, 28. *Rev.* 3. 12. and *John* 10. 35, 36.

*B.* But, Sir, our Saviour forgave Sins too.

*A.* That's true, but (2) *only by a deputed Authority.* You ſee when the Sons of *Zebbedee* petition'd him, he could not grant the final Accompliſhment of our Spiritual Warfare, that was the Father's Prerogative, *Matth.* 2c. 23. And tho' he is to be our Judge, yet he knows not the time, *Mark.* 13. 31. 1 *Tim.* 6. 15.

*B.* I muſt confeſs, theſe things a little ſurprize me; but however, I cannot think theſe neither the only Grounds that ſupport that Myſtery of the Trinity.

*A.* No, you are in the right; there is one ſtrong Proof more; the *making of all things viſible and inviſible* is attributed to the Son, and that expreſly, *John.* 1. 3 *Heb.* 1. 10 and particularly, *Col.* 1. 16, 17, 18, 19. But yet for all that, if we do not adhere with the Catholick Church to the Literal Interpretation, we are at a loſs there too: For, firſt, 'tis plain by the reſt of Scripture, (3) *that the Son is not our only Maker, as appears by our Creation attributed to the Father*; and then if we compare thoſe Texts to *Heb.* 1. 2, 9, 10. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Eph.* 3. 9. *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27, 28. we cannot reaſonably attribute more to the Son, than his being God's Inſtrument in the Creation.

*B.* But are theſe the true and only Grounds of the Doctrine of that Holy Myſtery?

*A.* Yes verily; for, (4) *that we are Baptiz'd in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is no Argument. That were as reaſonable, if underſtood of Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt, as our Spiritual Governours*, as under the ſuppoſal of their being Co-equal with the Father, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. 1 *Cor.* 12. 12, 13.

(*o*) I do not think this a proper place, nor a juſt occaſion to enter into the diſpute of the Trinity. What he here alledges,

ledges, has been anſwered a hundred times over, both by the ancient Fathers and Modern Writers, both Romaniſt and Proteſtants; and if he dare ſay, when he has taken off his *Arian* Vizard, that they are not well, and ſufficiently anſwered, I will be bound to defend Catholick Chriſtianity againſt this new kind of *Liberian Roman Catholick*. But it would move the Indignation of any good Chriſtian, though a *Roman-Catholick*, to ſee ſo Sacred a Myſtery made the Subject of Wit and Criticiſm, and little better then Drollery, (1) that Chriſt cannot be God, becauſe he is Lord, as if he could not be God and Lord too; that he is not the Second Perſon in the Trinity, becauſe he is not the firſt, and therefore as a Son, eſpecially as a Mediator ſubordinate to his Father. (2) That he forgives Sins only as Prieſts do *by a deputed Authority*. (3) That he did not make the World, becauſe the Father made it, and therefore he is but Gods Inſtrument in the Creation; as if in Creation, which is the immediate effect of Divine and Almighty Power, there could be any created Inſtrument. (4) That we may be Baptized into the Name *of the Son and Holy Ghoſt*, as Spiritual Governours, when the Ancient Church thought this Form of Baptiſm to be the Foundation of the Creed, and there is no other difference expreſſed in the Form between *Baptiſing in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and Holy Ghoſt*, but the order of Perſons.

*B.* But ſurely, Sir, the *Arians* ſhould have other Grounds to eſtabliſh their Opinions, beſides thoſe, or elſe your Parallel with Tranſubſtantiation will not be ſo demonſtrable as you conceive. Pray inform me a little further, I have a mighty deſire to underſtand a little better their Fundamental Principles.

*A.* To ſatisfie you, I ſhall. (p) *Firſt, They alledge Chriſt repreſented under the Law altogether as an Angel; for Eminency call'd* the Angel of the Preſence, *Iſa.* 63. 9. *Eccl.* 5. 6. *Gen* 48. 16. *Num.* 20. 16. *Exod.* 23. 20, 21, 22. refer'd to 1 Cor. 10. 4, 5, 9. Further, they collect him to be a created Being, from *Col.* 1. 15. *Rev.* 3. 14. *Pſal.* 118. 23. *Iſa.* 45. 8. *Eccluſ.* 1. 4, 9. *Eccluſ.* 24. 9. *Sap.* 6. 22, 23. (q) *And they interpret that Scripture,* Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, *by* Acts 13. 33. *and* 2 Pet. 1. 17. As to (r) *the Holy Ghoſt, they prove a vaſt diſtance between him and the Son,* by *John* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15. and *John* 15. 26. Beſides, they ſay, he is no where call'd God; and urge for the probability of their Opinion, *Rev.* 12. 9. *Rev.* 20. 8.

2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *For as there is an univerſal tempting Evil Power*, ſo we may reaſonably conclude, there may be a Good Aſſiſting Power, without any neceſſity of his being God. And further, where-ever in the Scriptures there is made any mention of the Three Perſons, there is always declar'd an expreſs Gradation; as 1 *Cor.* 12. 3, 4, 5. 2 *Cor.* 13. 14. Gift and Communion from the Fellowſhip of the Holy Ghoſt, Grace and Adminiſtration from the Lordſhip and Kingſhip of Chriſt, and Love and Operation from the Father, the Supreme God, the Original Fountain, according to *Epheſ.* 4. 4, 5, 6.

(*p*) That Chriſt is called in the Old Teſtament *the Angel of the preſence*, I grant, but affirm alſo, that *the Angel of the preſence* was no created Angel, but the Lord *Jehovah*, who ſpake to *Moſes* in the Buſh, as the Ancient Fathers grant.

(*q*) To be the firſt born of every Creature, does not prove that he is a Creature, but that he was begotten of God before any Creatures were made, that is, before the Creation of the World, and that ſignifies an Eternal Generation; for nothing was before the Creation of the World, but that which is Eternal and uncreated, as is ſufficiently intimated in this very Text, 1 *Col.* 16, 17, 18. and then it is no injury to the Eternal Generation of Chriſt; though we grant that he was begotten again at his Reſurrection from the Dead.

(*r*) As for the Holy Spirit, he is indeed called the Spirit of Chriſt, and is ſaid to be ſent by Chriſt, as he is by his Father; but this proves only that he is the Third Perſon in the Trinity, and in the Æconomy of Mans Salvation, acts as a Vicarious power to Chriſt the Redeemer. But his very Office to Inſpire and Sanctifie, and dwell in the whole Chriſtian Church, and every Chriſtian proves him to be God; not only becauſe the Chriſtian Church and Chriſtians are his Temple, but becauſe no Created Spirit can dwell in all Chriſtians. For what this Convert alledges of *an univerſal tempting* evil *power*, is no better than *Manichiſm*, or to aſſert an evil God. For an univerſal power is a God; and did one Devil tempt and poſſeſs all bad Men, as one and the ſame Holy Spirit dwells in all good Men, he would be an omnipreſent and infinite Devil, which is what the *Manichees* call an evil God, and ſure this is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which is a ſign that our Author is but a new Convert.

*B.* I must confess, Sir, these Opinions seem to make it necessary for us in that Doctrine too, to trust to the Authority of the Catholick Church, and I shall take time to consider a little upon them: But pray, Sir, what say you to the Reasons of the two Doctrines?

*A.* Really, (*s*) *Sir, I must tell you, I think that Parellel much the easiest. 'Tis strange new Arithmetick to a man, to tell him, Three distinct Persons are one and the same Individual Nature,* and then to call such a one the most Pure and Simple Being; and that especially when they are declar'd to have various Intellectual Powers, as appears by *John* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15. and *Mark* 13. 31. 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. *Acts* 1. 7. For my part, I cannot tell well how the Prejudice of Education could possibly digest a thing so unreasonable, were it not a Divine Mystery. I am sure, (*t*) *to my carnal Reason, there may be as well Three Hundred Persons in the Godhead, as Three*; and I know not what can be said of Transubstantiation, that is seemingly more absurd than That.

*B.* I must confess, Sir, I have had strange, confus'd, and surprizing Thoughts of it my self; but I always apprehended the Christian Church a sufficient Guide.

*A.* If you did, Sir, pray consider who that Catholick Mother is you so obey'd; and as you have receiv'd the *Trinity*, so receive a Doctrine equally as reasonable, and deliver'd by Her, *Transubstantiation.* I know the Ingenuousness of your Temper, and you promis'd me at first not to be a wilful Schismatick; and therefore I have hopes my Reasons, and your Consideration, will be sufficient to reduce you to Catholick Communion.

*B.* Sir, I shall consider of it; but as yet you only talk'd to me at large: I shall desire one Favour of you before we part; Pray state the Parallel a little shorter, I shall the better remember it.

*A.* Well, Sir, I shall. First, the Tradition of one Doctrine cannot be stronger than another, where both have been at least equally question'd. Secondly, 'Tis as reasonable to take *This is my Body*, literally, as it is to take these Texts, *I and my Father are one God over all blessed for ever*; and *By him all things were made*, without reference to other Scriptures, and a Figurative Interpretation. And lastly, I think to human Reason 'tis as equally unreasonable, and as seemingly repugnant, to say One is Three, as it is to say a Body is not what it appears.

*B.* Very well, I shall desire no more of you now: I'le only take a little time to consider, and then you shall know my mind more freely.

*A.* Farewel; and God give you his Holy Spirit to instruct you.

(*s*) And now we are come to the main Point, Whether the Doctrine of the *Trinity* be as absurd and contradictious as the

Doctrine

Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which God forbid it ſhould be. I am ſure *the Arithmetick* is very good; for Three Perſons and one Nature, is no bad Arithmetick. To ſay, that there are Three Perſons and but One Perſon, and but One Nature, and yet Three Natures, had been no good Arithmetick, but a plain Contradiction, that Three are One, and One Three in the ſame reſpect, which God himſelf cannot make true; but Three Perſons and One Nature is no Contradiction, how incomprehenſible ſoever it may be. He has made it a Contradiction indeed by ſaying, That *Three diſtinct Perſons are one and the ſame Individual Nature*; but whoever before ſaid, that the Perſon is the Nature, or that the Divine Nature is an individual Nature, or a Nature appropriated to one Perſon, which is the ſignification of an individual Nature. I ſuppoſe he had heard ſomewhere of *individua Trinitas*, and this he miſtook for an individual Nature. Theſe are indeed Contradictions, and new invented Hereſies, but this is not the Catholick Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

(*t*) We cannot indeed comprehend how Three diſtinct Perſons ſhould ſubſiſt in one Nature, for we ſee no example of it in Nature; for in finite Creatures, one finite Nature is confined to one Perſon; but a finite Nature, I hope, is no rule for an infinite Nature, and therefore an infinite Nature may be common to more Perſons than one, though a finite Nature cannot; and it may be, it is as intelligible how Three diſtinct Perſons may ſubſiſt in one infinite Nature, as how three diſtinct Faculties can be in the ſame finite Soul; by which Compariſon the Ancients explain'd the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. The Omnipreſence, Omniſcience, Omnipotence, Eternity of God, are as much above our Comprehenſion, as a Plurality of Perſons in the Deity; and if men will but allow, that God is incomprehenſible, this can be no Objection againſt the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. Natural Reaſon indeed cannot diſcover the Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead, and therefore I can give no Reaſon why there ſhould be Three Perſons, and neither more nor leſs; as the Plurality of Perſons, ſo the number of them depends wholly upon Revelation; and the Scripture aſſures me, there are but Three, and therefore I believe no more.

And

And becauſe there are no more, therefore I believe it is impious to ſay, *That there may be as well Three Hundred Perſons in the Godhead, as Three.*

Thus the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, tho it be above the comprehenſion of our finite minds, as every thing muſt be, which is infinite, yet it does not contradict any neceſſary Principle of Reaſon, as *Tranſubſtantiation* does, which is contrary to Senſe and Reaſon. Whether any Body be Bread or Fleſh, fall under the notice of Senſe, and therefore our Senſes muſt judg of it; and all our Senſes tell us, that the conſecrated Bread and Wine, is Bread and Wine ſtill, not Fleſh and Blood; ſo that we have greater evidence againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, than we can have againſt the *Trinity*; for we have the evidence of Senſe, that it is not Fleſh, but Bread; and no man can pretend to ſuch evidence as this, that there are not Three Divine Perſons in the Godhead, and this makes ſome difference between them.

As for Reaſon, if we cannot underſtand, what the Properties of a Body are, we can know nothing; and therefore this is a proper Object of human Reaſon, though the *Trinity* is not; and if our Reaſon diſcover a great many Abſurdities, and Contradictions, and Impoſſibilities in *Tranſubſtantiation*, we muſt confeſs, that it is abſurd and impoſſible, as to take notice of ſome few.

To ſay that the Subſtance of the Bread is turned into the natural Fleſh of Chriſt, which ſuffered on the Croſs ſixteen hundred years ago, is to ſay, that the Body of Chriſt is made to day, which was 1600 years ago, which is a Contradiction; for what was made 1600 years ago, cannot be made to day, unleſs it was 1600 years before it was made; or was made 1600 years after it was made, and thus the ſame individual Body muſt be, and not be at the ſame time.

It is eſſential to the ſame Body to be but in one place at a time, and yet all confeſs, that the Body of Chriſt is whole and intire in Heaven, how then is the ſame Body at the ſame time on the Altar? nay, on as many Altars as there are in the Chriſtian World, at the ſame time.

The Body of Chriſt in Heaven has the juſt Proportions and Dimenſions of a human Body; in the conſecrated Hoſt it is with-

without any extenſion or diſtinction of parts, whole and entire in the leaſt Crumb of Bread: now for the ſame individual Body to be extended, and not extended at the ſame time, is a contradiction; and tho we could ſuppoſe that Chriſt could beſtow ſuch a ſupernatural kind of Exiſtence on his Body, as to ſubſiſt without Extenſion of parts, yet how can the ſame Body at the ſame time be extended and not extended, as it muſt be, if the ſame Body be extended in Heaven, and not extended in the Hoſt. The Sacramental Body of Chriſt is cloathed with the Species of Bread, is it ſo in Heaven too? if not, how is the ſame Body at the ſame time, with and without the Species of Bread? The Sacramental Body of Chriſt is his dead and broken Body, the Body of Chriſt in Heaven is a living, glorified Body; now if this be the ſame Body, the ſame Body muſt be dead and alive, broken and whole at the ſame time.

The *Romaniſts* tell us, that the conſecrated Bread is the whole Body of Chriſt, Fleſh and Blood too, which muſt go together; and yet that the conſecrated Cup is the natural Blood of Chriſt ſhed out of his Body; ſo that it ſeems, the ſame Body on the Altar is both broken and whole, and the ſame Blood is in his Veins, and poured out of them at the ſame time. Now I would ask, Whether Chriſt in Heaven have any Blood, which is ſeparated from his Body; if he have not, then how is the conſecrated Cup, which is his Blood ſhed for us, and therefore out of his Body, that natural Blood which Chriſt now has in Heaven, where to be ſure, he has no Blood, which is out of his Body, and therefore that Blood, which is out of his Body, cannot be his natural Blood, which he now has in Heaven.

When our Author has digeſted theſe Abſurdities and Contradictions, I can eaſily furniſh him with more; and can there be a greater contempt of the ever bleſſed *Trinity*, than to compare ſo ſacred and venerable a Myſtery, to the moſt abſurd Doctrine, which was ever invented by Men.

It will be in vain to pray to God *to give us his Holy Spirit to inſtruct us*, till we firſt learn to believe our own Senſe and Reaſon.

The E N D.

1c

# A PROTESTANT OF THE Church of England, NO DONATIST.

OR, SOME SHORT NOTES ON Lucilla and Elizabeth.

Licenſed, *Decemb.* 8. 1686.

*LONDON*,
Printed for *T. Baſſet*, at the *George*, near St. *Dunſtan's* Church, in *Fleetſtreet*. 1686.

## (a) Lucilla and Elizabeth. (b)

(a) *Lucilla*, a Private, though Rich and Powerfull Woman, and therefore a fit Patroness for a Faction, but no Legal Reformer.

(b) *Elizabeth*, a Sovereign Princess, who had Authority, in Her own Kingdoms, to Reform the Church; which makes some difference between them.

OR,

## DONATIST and PROTESTANT (c)

(c) Papist had been here a more proper Parallel, than a Protestant, but that he is not so Orthodox as a Donatist, though as great a Schismatick.

# SCHISM
## *PARALLEL'D.*

| *Donatism.* | Protestancy. |
|---|---|
| 1. Ordain'd Anti-Bishops. | 1. *Ordain'd Anti-Bishops.* |

An Anti-Bishop is one set up against another Lawfull Bishop, in the same Diocese.

1. *Such the Papists have in* Ireland, *as the Donatists had.*

1. Such the Church of *England* has not, that we know of; and if there be any Such, they must be Popish Anti-Bishops.

| *Donatiſm.* | Proteſtancy. |
|---|---|
| 2. Erected Anti-Altars. | 2. *Erected Anti-Tables.* |

2. There can be no Anti-Altars, nor Anti-Tables, where there are no Anti-Biſhops.

3. Impeach'd all other Churches of Apoſtacy.

3. *Impeach'd the whole Church of Superſtition, Idolatry, and Anti-chriſtianiſm.*

3. *Rome, like the Donatiſt, does this; for She allows of no True Churches, but what are in Communion with, and Subjection to the Pope.*

3. No, only the Church of *Rome*, and not So as to Unchurch her neither, as Donatiſts and Papiſts do.

4. Communicated with no other Church in Religious Offices.

4. *Communicates, in Sacred Duties, with no Chriſtian Society.*

4. *Thus Papiſts communicate with none, but in their own Communion*; *and that is to Communicate with no other Church.*

4. We reject no Chriſtians, who will Communicate with us; and are ready to Communicate with all Churches, who do not impoſe Sinfull Terms of Communion, nor require a Corrupt Worſhip.

5. Appeal'd from the Churches Sentence in a Spiritual Cauſe to a Lay-Prince.

5. *Appeal'd from the Churches Decrees to the Princes Supremacy, advancing it in all Spiritual Caſes, above any Authority Eccleſiaſtical, whatſoever.*

5. *Popes have depoſed Princes, and abſolved Subjects from their Oaths of Fidelity, which is a greater Crime.*

5. The Supremacy we allow to Princes is not the Exerciſe of any Spiritual Power, but ſuch a Power as the Catholick Church has always allowed to Chriſtian Princes, *viz.* to have the Supreme Government of the Church in their Dominions, as incorporated into the State; which muſt be allowed to Sovereign Power, or it is not Sovereign.

*Dona-*

| *Donatiſm.* | Proteſtancy. |
| --- | --- |
| 6. Yet continued the Catholick Creed, Sacraments, Liturgies, Regiment and Solemnities, as they were before the Schiſm. | 6. *Continues Baptiſm and the Creed (in moſt Articles) but errs concerning the Euchariſt and other our Lord's Sacraments, abrogating the Liturgies, Rites, Canons, Faſts and Feſtivals; as alſo the Spiritual Juriſdiction of the Church, and Canonical Obedience to the Weſtern Patriarch.* |

6. *This the Church of* Rome *does not, but has done that which is worſe,* viz. *Corrupted the Catholick Faith; not by denying any Article of the Creed, but by adding New Doctrines to it; by increaſing the Number, and altering the Nature of Sacraments; by corrupting Liturgies, and the Faſts and Feſtivals of the Church; and ſo are much worſe, upon this account, than the Donatiſts, who did not Corrupt the Chriſtian Faith.*

6. We retain the whole Faith, and Inſtitutions of Chriſt, intire; which, I hope, is no Fault, either in Donatiſts, or in the Church of *England*. We retain the ancient Uſe of Faſts and Feſtivals; and vindicate our Juſt Liberties from the Uſurpations of the Biſhop of *Rome*; who is not contented to be the Weſtern Patriarch, but will be an Univerſal Biſhop, the Sovereign Head of the Church, and Infallible Judge of Controverſies. By which extravagant Claims, he juſtly Forfeits even that Patriarchal Right, which the Canons of the Church formerly allowed him, in honour to the Imperial City, of which he was Biſhop: For when a Grant upon meer Courteſy is improved into Tyranny and Uſurpation, there is no Obligation to continue thoſe Reſpects, which are now Challenged not upon Courteſy, but as an Original and Inviolable Right; and improved, from honourable Reſpects, into Empire and unlimited Juriſdiction. However, we need not trouble our ſelves with this Diſpute. The Britiſh Churches, for Six hundred Years after Chriſt, never had any Dependance on *Rome*; and what was after this was only Uſurpation, and an uſurped Authority may be renounced without Schiſm.

*A.* St. *Auguſtin's* Cenſure againſt the *Donatiſts* involving *Proteſtants.*

A. *And why not* involving *Papiſts as well as Proteſtants? For we have leſs to do with Donatiſm than they have. What St.* Auſtin *ſays againſt the Donatiſts is upon the account of their Schiſm, and may indeed be applied to other Schiſmaticks: But before they can be applied to us, they muſt prove us to be Schiſmaticks; which is not ſo eaſy to do, as to take it for granted; which our Author, I ſee, is moſt inclined to. But, if the Schiſmatick ſhould fall to their own ſhare, they muſt take the Cenſure of St.* Auſtin *to themſelves.*

*Epiſt.* 48. B. YOU [Donatiſts] *are with us* [Catholics] *in Baptiſm, in the Creed, and in the reſt of our Lord's Sacraments; but in the Spirit of Unity, in the Bond of Peace, laſtly, in the Catholick Church it ſelf, you are not with us.*

B. TO agree in Faith and Worſhip, and yet to divide Communion, is certainly a notorious Schiſm. And thus St. *Auſtin* proves the Donatiſts to be Schiſmaticks; That they had the ſame Baptiſm, the ſame Creed, the ſame Sacraments, but would not Communicate with them; and thereby Divided themſelves from the Catholick Church; did not Preſerve *the Spirit of Unity in the Bond of Peace*, but Refuſed to own themſelves of the ſame Church. And this muſt be Schiſm; for nothing can juſtify a Separation, but a Corruption of Faith or Worſhip. But the Caſe is vaſtly different between us and the Church of *Rome*. For we have not the ſame Creed, the ſame Sacraments, and the ſame Worſhip: The Council of *Trent* has added a great many new Articles to our Creed; has made a great many new Sacraments, and corrupted the old ones, and has introduced a new and ſtrang Worſhip, the Worſhip of Saints and Angels, and Service in an Unknown Tongue, into the Chriſtian Church. And this is the Reaſon not of our Separating from, but of their Flinging us out of their Communion. And this Caſe St. *Auſtin* ſays nothing of; but we are ready to prove, That it is no Schiſm.

*Epiſt.* 153. C. *The Sacraments of* Chriſt, *which in the Sacrilege of Schiſm you* [Donatiſts] *have to Judgment, will be profitable and wholſom to you, when you ſhall have the Head,* Chriſt, *in Catholic Peace, where Charity will cover a multitude of Sins.*

C. If they apply this to us, then they muſt at leaſt grant, That we have very good Sacraments in our Church, ſuch as are *profitable* and *wholſom*; and convey to us all the Vertue and Benefit of Sacraments, till they can prove us guilty of Schiſm: And we deſire to injoy the Benefit of our Sacraments no longer.

*De Unitate Eccleſiæ, c.* 4. D. *Whoſoever believes* Chriſt Jeſus *to be come in the Fleſh,* &c. *but yet ſo diſſent from his Body, which is his Church,* as that their Communion is not with the whole, wherever diffuſed, but is found Separated in ſome part, *'tis manifeſt they are not in the Catholic Church.*

*D.* This was a good Argument in St. *Auſtin's* time; when the whole Catholick Church was in one Communion, without any Corruptions in Faith and Worſhip to

to juſtifie a Separation. For, in this Caſe, whoever ſeparated from any Society of Chriſtians, ſeparated from the whole Chriſtian Church; and nothing elſe was neceſſary to prove them Schiſmaticks, but only their Separation; which was as viſible a Schiſm, as tearing an Arm or Leg from the Body. For when the whole Church was one Communion, without any Corruptions of Faith or Worſhip, there could be no Diſpute which was the True Catholick Church; and to Separate from the Catholick Church is certainly Schiſm. This was the Caſe of the Donatiſts, againſt whom St. *Auſtin* wrote that Book *de Unitate*. They had nothing to object againſt the Faith or Worſhip of the Catholick Church; but only pretended, that they Communicated with Traditors, or thoſe who were Ordained by them, that is, With thoſe who, in the Times of Perſecution, delivered up their Bibles to the Perſecutors; which yet was not ſo great a Fault as taking away the Bible from the People, (which if they had not had in thoſe Days, they could not have delivered it) and perſecuting thoſe who uſe it.

But when the Church is divided in Faith and Worſhip, into a great many different and oppoſite Communions, it is a ridiculous thing for any Part of the Church to call it ſelf the Whole; and then to charge others, as St. *Auſtin* does the Donatiſts, with Separating from the Whole; eſpecially, when ſuch a Separation is occaſioned by ſuch Corruptions as are dangerous to Mens Souls. Which is vaſtly different from the ſtate of the Church in St. *Auſtin*'s time; and therefore what he ſays cannot be immediately applied to us. They muſt firſt prove, that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church, and a Pure and Uncorrupt Church; and then we will grant, that not to Communicate with them is Schiſm.

E. *This Church is the Body of* Chriſt, *as the Apoſtle ſaith*, Col. 1. 24. For his Body, which is his Church. *Whence ſurely 'tis manifeſt, That he who is no Member of* Chriſt, *cannot have Chriſtian Salvation. But the Members of* Chriſt *are joyn'd to each other by the Charity of Unity, and by the ſame* [Charity] *do they cohere to their Head*, Chriſt Jeſus. *Cap.* 2.

E. To ſeparate from the Body of Chriſt is certainly Schiſm; but St. *Auſtin* in the ſame place tells us, that there is a Separation from the Head, as well as from the Body; that is, from Chriſt who is the Head, as well as from his Body, which is his Church. The firſt is a Schiſm occaſioned by Hereſy; the ſecond is a cauſleſs Schiſm without any corruption in Faith and Worſhip. So that He never intended that, for fear of Schiſm, we ſhould Communicate with a very Corrupt Church; but only warns us not to Separate from the Church of Chriſt, when ſuch a Church does not Separate from Chriſt. But as far as any Church, or Society of Chriſtians, Separates from Chriſt, the Head, ſo far we may and ought to Separate from them.

F. *Whoſoever therefore is Separated from this Catholick Church, how laudably ſoever he thinks himſelf to live, for this only Crime, that he is disjoyn'd from the Unity of* Chriſt, *he ſhall not have life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* *Epiſt.* 153.

F. As for the evil and danger of Schiſm, we perfectly agree with this Father; and will ſay as Ill things of it, as the Church of *Rome* her ſelf can deſire: But we are not afraid of theſe Ill Conſequences of Schiſm, while we are no Schiſmaticks.

G. NOW St. Auguſtin *places the* Donatiſts *Schiſm in their not joyning with* Catholicks *in Religious Offices, In forſaking all Chriſtian Aſſemblies, In not partaking with them of the Euchariſt, In Prayers*, &c. *Whence he concludes them*

*not*

*not to belong to the Catholic Church, Not to be Members of* Christ's *Mystical Body, Not to have Charity, Not Sacraments to Benefit, Not Piety with Hope, nor Salvation.*

G. THIS is all very true, and this was the Character of the Donatiſt Schiſm. They were charged with no Hereſy, for they were Guilty of none; but only with Separating from the Communion of the Catholick Church, in Prayers, and Sacraments, which is a Separation; and if it be Cauſleſs, as it was in the Donatiſts, has the Guilt of Schiſm: But is a very juſt Separation, and no Schiſm, if it have a juſt Cauſe.

*H. Have Prelatical* Proteſtants *of* Great Britain *and* Ireland *any viſible Communion, in the Euchariſt or other Divine Service, with any Chriſtian Church on Earth? If they have not, as is undeniable, then according to St.* Auguſtin, *they are not in the Catholic Church, are not Members of* Chriſt, *are without Charity, beneficial Sacraments, hopeful Holineſs, and eternal Salvation.*

*H.* Do the *Prelatical Proteſtants of Great Britain* and *Ireland* refuſe Communion with, or deny Communion to, *any Church on Earth,* without a Cauſe? If they do not, they are Innocent; if they ſay we do, let them prove it. We have nothing in our Worſhip that can hinder any Chriſtian (not Roman-Catholicks themſelves) from Communicating with us; and then, if they will not do it, it is their own Faults. We refuſe Communion with no Church, with whom we can Communicate without Sin; and it is no Fault to refuſe Communion, when it cannot be had without Sin. And therefore we are ſtill *in the Catholick Church,* (and, I believe, the beſt Reformed part of the Catholick Church,) we are *Members of Chriſt,* have *true Chriſtian Charity* (ſo much, even for the Church of *Rome*, that it is made by themſelves an Argument againſt us) and therefore doubt not to receive all the *benefit of Sacraments*; and, if we live holily, to receive the Fruits of it *in eternal Salvation.*

I. *And this Cenſure by ſo much the more juſtly belongs to them, as their Schiſm is more contumacious, their Calumnies againſt the Catholick Church more horrid, and their Defection by Hereſie, as well as Schiſm, wider than the* Donatiſts.

*I. Contumacy* can never be in a good Cauſe, and that we are ſure ours is. Though had he known any thing of the Story of the Donatiſts, he would have known, That no Man can be more conſtant, and vertuouſly ſteddy, in a good Cauſe, than they were contumaciouſly Obſtinate in a bad one. We do not *calumniate the Catholick Church,* God forbid! nay, not the Roman Church; for though we ſay a great many Ill things of them, they are True, and that is no Calumny. And are we the greater Schiſmaticks, becauſe we juſtifie our Separation, by laying the Fault on the Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*? If the Donatiſts could have done ſo, St. *Auſtin* would not have thought them ſo much the worſe Schiſmaticks, but no Schiſmaticks at all. And as for *Hereſy*, when This Author can prove us guilty of that, we will allow our ſelves to be worſe Schiſmaticks than the Donatiſts were.

*The End.*